

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 890

RC 006 768

AUTHOR Oberle, Wayne H.
 TITLE Role Models of Negro and White Rural Youth at Two Stages of Adolescence.
 INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.
 SPONS AGENCY Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.; Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
 REPORT NO TAES-H-2611
 PUB DATE 71
 NOTE 25p.; Revision of a paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1971
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
 DESCRIPTORS *Adolescence; Decision Making Skills; Ethnic Studies; *Longitudinal Studies; Negroes; *Occupational Aspiration; *Role Models; *Rural Youth; Social Status; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data)
 IDENTIFIERS *East Texas

ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper was to investigate the utility of the Ginzberg developmental model for explaining differences in the types or occupational status of the role models of Negro and white rural youth at two stages of adolescence. Data were obtained from 484 youth residing in East Texas in their sophomore and senior years in high school. In the patterns that did not differ over time, the findings indicated that Negro boys selected more teachers and glamour figures as role models than did the white boys, that white boys chose more relatives, and that white boys had a more diverse selection pattern than did their Negro age cohorts. In patterns that did differ over time for Negro and white girls, it was found that whereas the white girls had a slightly more diverse selection pattern than did the Negro girls in 1966, the opposite was true in 1968. Additional conclusions were that more white boys than Negro boys chose occupational role models who were owners or managers of a farm or ranch, but the difference decreased over time; that more white girls than Negro girls selected housewives as role models; and that, although occupational role models in professional or related areas were equally popular among both Negro and white respondents in 1966, more Negro girls than white girls chose this type of role model in 1968. (HBC)



ROLE MODELS OF NEGRO AND WHITE RURAL YOUTH
AT TWO STAGES OF ADOLESCENCE

Wayne H. Oberle
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Texas A&M University

Abstract

According to the "developmental model" of Eli Ginzberg and others, the decisions of young people become more realistic over time. Data obtained from 484 rural youth residing in East Texas at two points in time (their sophomore [1966] and senior [1968] years in high school) are used to test an application of the model: that youth increasingly want to pattern their lives after non-glamour figures. Four hypotheses guided the analysis: (1) that Negro and white boys select different role models at both points in time; (2) that Negro and white girls select different role models at both points in time; (3) that the occupational status of the role models of Negro and white group are different at both points in time; and (4) that the occupational status of the role models of Negro and white boys are different at both points in time. The findings supported (1) - (4). Implications of these and other patterns for the future analysis of the status attainment process are discussed.

[1971]

¹ A revision of a paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1971. This research was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to TAES project H-2611 and USDA (CSRS) project S-61, "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South." The assistance of William P. Kuvlesky and Kathryn Thomas Dietrich is gratefully acknowledged.

Role Models of Negro and White Rural Youth at Two Stages of Adolescence

The recent demonstration of the importance of significant others' influence in the status attainment process (Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf, 1970) has accentuated the need for more research on the utility of the "developmental model" (Ginzberg, et. al., 1951; Blau, et. al., 1956; Musgrave, 1967; Rodgers, 1966) according to which the decisions of young people become more realistic over time.² The objective of this paper is to utilize longitudinal data from a recent Texas study to investigate the utility of the model for explaining differences in the types or occupational status of the role models of Negro and white rural youth at two stages of adolescence: the youth were originally interviewed in 1966 as high school sophomores and were recontacted two years later.³

Previous research on social mobility in the United States has generally demonstrated that the occupational opportunities for Negroes (especially for those that are male and lower class) are limited. Although middle-class goals or values dominate in American society (Merton, 1957: 136-137; Adams, 1967:365), the aspiration or desire for success is more common among Negroes than its actual attainment (Broom and Glenn, 1965:23-24; Blau and Duncan, 1967:404-405).

There are at least several reasons why Negroes are exposed to the success ethic but yet seldom realize it personally. First, representatives of the educational system and the mass media continually instill middle-class goals or values in all elements of the population (Adams, 1967:365).⁴ Second, although educational attainment has been recognized as one of the most direct channels for vertical mobility for decades (Sorokin, 1927:

170; Broom and Glenn, 1965:81-82; Mack, 1969:150-151), it also has been known for some time that Negroes who remain in school through the twelfth grade are a very select group (Middleton and Grigg, 1959:353).⁵ Third, although Negroes believe that low educational attainment does not so seriously impede success in glamour fields (such as popular entertainment, professional sports, and government) (Broom and Glenn, 1965:150-151), only a small percentage of them actually obtain employment in these fields. Fourth, the educational difficulties of Negroes are further compounded by (Broom and Glenn, 1965:81-82) (a) rising educational standards that exert pressure on all youth, (b) rising pursuit of higher education by white youth, and (c) an apparently continuing structure of cumulative discriminatory disadvantages for Negroes (Mack, 1969:150-151).

Given the limited opportunity for Negroes to experience upward mobility in the glamour fields, their selection of glamour figures as role models may indicate another reason why the upward mobility of Negroes in American society is beset with barriers: identification with a particular role model or reference group can inhibit rather than facilitate mobility. Accordingly, knowledge about racial differences, if any, in the selection of glamour figures and other role models at different stages of adolescence may help explain the racial differentials in status attainment mentioned above.⁶

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To the knowledge of the authors, there has been only one other study (Oberle and Kuvlesky, 1971) which has explicitly examined which type (e.g., teachers, glamour figures) of role models adolescents select for future identification from a list of diverse types. The study of metropolitan

and nonmetropolitan Negro youth found that, place of residence made minor differences in the dependent variable and that sex made a substantial difference in the dependent variable.⁷ Although the latter were again considerably larger than the former, the study also found that residence and sex differences do exist in the occupational status of the youths' role models. The present study extends the analysis of that study in two ways: (1) it examines racial differences as well as sex differences; and (2) it examines the dynamics of selection, thereby investigating the utility of the developmental model according to which the decisions of adolescents become more realistic over time (Ginzberg et. al., 1951). Although there has been a lack of research on racial differences in the types of and occupational status of role models over time, previous researchers (Reiss and Rhodes, 1963:143; Broom and Glenn, 1965:24) have indicated that social class or socioeconomic status makes a much smaller difference in the vertical mobility of Negroes than race. The above reasons collectively suggest the utility of analysis directed at the following hypotheses: (1) that Negro and white boys select different role models at two different periods of adolescence; (2) that Negro and white girls select different role models at two periods of adolescence; (3) that the occupational status of the role models of Negro and white boys are different at two periods of adolescence; and (4) that the occupational status of the role models of Negro and white girls are different at two periods of adolescence.

RESEARCH DESIGN

We interviewed all high school sophomores attending school in three all rural, nonmetropolitan counties of East Texas.⁸ In addition to rurality,

these counties were purposefully selected to provide study units composed of a disproportionately large number of Negroes and poor families.⁹ These rural counties are characterized by social structures and values indicative of the "traditional South." The sophomore classes of the 13 all-Negro schools involved ranged from 5 to 30 students.

A questionnaire requiring from 35 minutes to an hour to complete was group administered in each school contacted during the spring of 1966. The respondents were assured of anonymity before starting on the questionnaire. No attempt was made to contact students enrolled in school but not present the day of the interview (8%) or persons of similar age but not enrolled in school. The composition of the study population by race and sex is described in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

The two basic comparative variables, race and sex, were self-indicated by respondents through simple check-off items and checked for validity against school records. Two additional variables are involved in the data analysis: types of the role models and occupational status of the role models.

The latter two variables are the dependent variables in this analysis. The indicator used for the former was response to a forced-choice question that asked the respondent to "Think of the person whom you would most want to fashion your life after." The nine alternative response categories covered a wide range of sources -- family, school, community, and mass media -- and are listed as follows:

- 1 A teacher or school counselor
- 2 Your father or mother
- 3 An older brother or sister
- 4 A relative not in your immediate family
- 5 A close friend, not related to you
- 6 A movie or TV star
- 7 A famous athlete
- 8 An important government official
- 9 Other (Who? _____)

For purpose of analysis the original categories of "movie or TV star," "famous athlete," and "Government official" were collapsed into a more inclusive category representing "glamour figures." In addition, a number of responses originally marked by the respondent as other were reclassified into other alternatives, particularly the "glamour" and a new analytical category, "non-glamour, professional and technical."

Since adolescents may identify with adults who may not be occupational role models, it is important to see if racial differences exist both in the types and occupational status of the role models selected by Negroes and white adolescents over time. We used responses to an open-ended question (which immediately followed the above-mentioned question) asking for the occupational status of the role model. These responses were grouped into one of the following modified Alba Edwards Census categories: (1) farm or ranch owner or manager; (2) laborer (including farm); (3) skilled trade, craft, or work; (4) operative or enlisted man in military; (5) owner, manager, or official of company, business, or government office; (6) sales and clerical work; (7) professional or technical worker or military officer; (8) glamour (professional sports, entertained); and (9) housewife.

RESULTS

The analysis consists of four parts. The first section examines racial differences, if any, in the types of role models selected by Negro and white boys at two different points in time: 1966 and 1968. The second section examines racial differences, if any, in the types of role models selected by Negro and white girls at two different points in time: 1966 and 1968. The third and fourth sections center on racial differences in the occupational status of the role models.

Types of Role Models

Negro and White Boys

There were substantial racial differences (statistically significant at .001 level) in the types of role models selected by Negro and white boys at two different points in time: 1966 and 1968 (Table 2). Secondary patterns indicating such differences in the dynamics of selection and worthy of note are:

- A. Patterns that did not differ over time:
 - (1) Negro boys selected more glamour figures than did the white boys.
 - (2) White boys chose more relatives (not in one's immediate family) than did the Negro boys.
 - (3) Negro boys selected more teachers than did their white age cohorts.
 - (4) White boys had a much more diverse selection pattern than did the Negro boys.
- B. Patterns that did differ over time:
 - (1) Whereas parents were equally popular among Negro and white boys in 1966, the former were less popular among Negro boys than white boys in 1968.
 - (2) Whereas the white boys selected more friends in 1966 than did the Negro boys, the difference was smaller in 1968.

Table 2 about here

In brief, there are substantial racial differences in the types of role models selected by Negro and white adolescents at both points in time.

Negro and White Girls

There were considerable racial differences (statistically significant at .001 level in 1966 and at .05 level in 1968) in the types of role models selected by Negro and white girls at two different points in time: 1966 and 1968 (Table 3). Although there were no selection patterns that held for both points in time, there were some secondary patterns that did differ over time:

- (1) Whereas the white girls selected more friends as role models in 1966 than did the Negro girls, the difference was smaller in 1968.
- (2) Similarly, whereas the Negro girls chose more glamour figures than did the white girls in 1966 and 1968, the magnitude of the difference decreased considerably over time.
- (3) Whereas only a few more Negro girls than white girls selected teachers as role models in 1966, the magnitude of the difference increased over time.
- (4) Whereas the white girls had a slightly more diverse selection pattern than did the Negro girls in 1966, the opposite was true in 1968.

Even more than was the case for Negro and white boys, parents are not the most frequently selected type of role model among Negro and white girls over time. Indeed, parents were, at best, only the third most frequently selected type of role model among Negro and white girls at either point in time.

Table 3 about here

In summary, results of the data analysis indicated (1) that there are substantial racial differences in the types of role models selected by Negro and white boys at both points in time; and (2) that there are considerable racial differences in the types of role models selected by Negro and white girls at both points in time. At least in terms of percentage differences by role model type, it is also noteworthy that racial differences in the role

models chosen by these rural youth increased among the boys and decreased among the girls over time. This pattern is illustrated by examining the selection of glamour figures: whereas those 49 and 21 percent of the Negro and white sophomore boys respectively selected glamour figures, 57 and 15 percent of the Negro and white respondents chose glamour figures two years later; in comparison, 26 and 6 percent of the Negro and white sophomore girls respectively selected glamour figures, only 16 and 4 percent of these respondents chose glamour figures two years later.

Occupational Status of Role Models

Negro and White Boys

There were substantial racial differences (statistically significant at .001 level) in the occupational status of the role models of the Negro and white boys at two different periods of adolescence (Table 4). Three secondary patterns are worthy of note; the first reflects substantial differences whereas the latter two do not. First, more Negro boys than white boys selected role models who held occupational positions in the glamour-related area. Indeed, 47 percent of the former and 17 percent of the latter selected glamour-related occupational role models in 1966 and 1968. Second, more white boys than Negro boys chose occupational role models who were owners or managers of a farm or ranch; however, the difference decreased over time. Third, more white boys than Negro boys selected role models who did skilled work; however, the difference was smaller in 1968 than in 1966. As in the case of the types of role models selected, racial differences in the occupational status of the role models of the Negro and white boys were linked to the differential choice of glamour figures.

Table 4 about here

Negro and White Girls

There were considerable racial differences (statistically significant at the .01 level) in the occupational status of the role models of the Negro and white girls at both points in time (Table 5). More specifically, four different secondary patterns contributed to the racial differences: although the first three concern patterns that generally did not vary from one point in adolescence to the other, the latter pattern did vary over time. First, more Negro girls than white girls selected role models who held positions in the glamour area. In contrast, more white girls than Negro girls chose saleswomen and clerks as role models. Third, more white girls than Negro girls selected housewives as role models. Fourth, although occupational role models in professional or related areas were equally popular among both Negro and white respondents in 1966, more Negro girls (56 percent) than white girls (45 percent) chose this type of role model in 1968.

Table 5 about here

DISCUSSION

Ginzberg and his associates (1951) asserted that the decisions of young people become increasingly realistic.¹⁰ If the "development model" was useful for their concern with describing and explaining changes in an adolescent's occupational aspirations and expectations, then it might also facilitate a focus on the role models who likely influence both educational and occupational status orientations. If the model has utility, then adolescents become increasingly knowledgeable of both the requirements for and the potential barriers of specific occupational positions as they approach high school graduation. Accordingly, high school sophomores would be less knowledgeable than they would be two years later. Thus, during the "realistic" stage of the socialization process the youth selects a field or occupation which he has a moderate or high probability of obtaining. Moreover, if there are structural barriers linked to race, then knowledge of such barriers might be evident in the selection of role models that have been relatively successful. Despite the limited opportunity for many Negroes to actually obtain employment (regardless of the probability of success) in glamour areas such as popular entertainment, professional sports, and government (Broom and Glenn, 1965:150-151), Negro high school youth (especially the males) who choose glamour figures as role models may be more realistic than those who select role models who hold positions with higher risk, more prestige, and higher entrance requirements.

The finding that Negro and white high school boys select substantially different types of role models at two different points in time suggests that the developmental model has utility for the analysis of adolescents' role models as well as for the analysis of their occupational aspirations and

expectations. The structurally realistic nature of the role models chosen by Negro boys at both points in time is underscored by the selection of glamour figures: whereas 28 percent more Negro than white boys selected glamour figures in 1966, 42 percent more Negro than white boys selected glamour figures in 1968. Thus, the magnitude of the racial difference clearly increased rather than decreased, thereby suggesting that the Negro boys did become more realistic in their role model selection as they approached graduation. Indeed, over half of the Negro boys selected glamour figures in 1968; this proportion was nearly four times as large as the corresponding figure (15 percent) for white boys. The selection of glamour figures by Negro and white girls in 1966 and 1968, also shows considerable consistency with the developmental model: the magnitude of the racial differences decreased from 20 percent in 1966 to 12 percent in 1968. Both of these interpretations are consistent with the assertion that Negroes emphasize education for girls rather than for boys (Broom and Glenn, 1965:19) and the finding that more Negro boys than Negro girls chose glamour figures as role models (Oberle and Kuvlesky).

Racial differences in the occupational status of the role models of Negro and white youth are similar to the racial differences in the types of role models which they select. Although true to a lesser extent for girls than for boys, racial differences in the occupational position of the adolescents' role models are closely linked to the differential preference for glamour figures. For example, the finding that 30 percent more of the Negro boys than the white boys selected glamour figures at both points in time illustrates this linkage. In brief, the racial differences in the types and occupational status of the role models of Negro and white adolescents at two points of adolescence are generally linked to the selection of glamour figures.

Turning to specific findings reported above, several interpretations can be given to the finding that Negro boys selected more glamour figures as occupational role models than did the white boys: (1) from the viewpoint of the Negro youth themselves, it may mean an opportunity to choose a field that promises large rewards, limited entrance requirements, and less racial discrimination. It is also plausible that Negro youth think that the high risk usually associated with glamour-related fields is not personally threatening to them because they might feel that they "have nothing to lose and everything to gain." A third interpretation is that glamour figures are popular among Negro boys because it is a career or occupational orientation that doesn't require any post-high-school education. Another interpretation is that male Negro youth may have been socialized to think that it is less than masculine to pursue advanced education: this is likely linked to the previously-noted assertion that Negroes emphasize education for girls rather than for boys. Yet another interpretation involves socio-cultural norms that are not linked to sex-linked Negro emphases on education: the pursuit of as much post-high-school education as possible in order to get a white-collar, well-paying job may be viewed as an escape or rejection of one's immediate family, race, or "people." Furthermore, such pursuit may mean too many family as well as personal sacrifices. Future research effort spent on delineating the comparative importance of these and other reasons would be useful.

Two other specific findings are noteworthy. First, the finding that at least 28 percent more of the Negro boys than white boys chose glamour figures and/or individuals who held positions in the glamour area suggests another hypothesis: that the former lack interaction opportunities with adults who hold positions that require substantial education or training.

Second, the finding that the Negro girls chose more role models who held professional (or related) positions in 1968 than did the white girls indicates that the Negro girls have apparently chosen to take a different route to upward vertical mobility or success than have their male counterparts.

Although the results of this study tentatively suggest that the development model also has some utility for role model analysis, they also raise many questions for future researchers of the status attainment process. One question is suggested by the finding that glamour figures are frequently selected by Negro and white boys and Negro girls: do adolescents necessarily interact with the person(s) after which they pattern their lives? Another question involves the occupational status of the role models selected: what difference does the title, income, prestige, or power of a particular status make on the type of role model selected? Third, to what extent do youth differentiate between role models and reference individuals? Fourth, do longitudinal data over longer periods of time indicate whether the preference for glamour figures is "unrealistic" in terms of subsequent attainments as well as structural opportunity? Fifth, will the finding that parents are not the most frequently chosen type of role model be characteristic of other populations at different points in the life cycle and in other geographical, cultural, and situational settings? Sixth, how accurate is the information that formal and informal socialization agents provide adolescents about such things as the probable costs and benefits of both obtaining and keeping specific jobs? Last, what techniques and observations do we have to clearly determine what are or are not "unrealistic" role model preferences, status projections, and/or actual occupational statuses?

FOOTNOTES

2. Oberle and Kuvlesky (1971) recently found that place of residence was not, but sex was related to the types and occupational status of the role models of Negro sophomores in Texas. The definitional problems associated with the concept role (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958:11-18) are not unknown to the concept reference group (Bott, 1954; Turner, 1956; MacCoby, Newcomb, and Hartley, 1958; Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958; Kemper, 1968; and Erikson, 1970). We accept Merton's (1957:302-303) distinction between a role model and a reference individual: "the person who identifies himself with a reference individual will seek to approximate the behavior and values of that individual in his several roles. The concept of role model can be thought of as more restricted in scope denoting a more limited identification with an individual in only one or a selected few of his roles." Accordingly, we reject the assertion (Sewell, Haller, and Portes, 1969:84-85) that the term "significant others" (defined as "the specific persons from whom the individual obtains his level of aspiration, either because they serve as models or because they communicate to him their expectations for his behavior,") is more appropriate than that of "reference group" because "it eliminates the implication that collectivities ...are necessarily the influential agents for all individuals." As defined, the former term complicates conceptual clarity (1) by minimizing, if not ignoring, the point that an individual does not necessarily identify with the persons with which he interacts; and (2) by over-emphasizing aspirational dimensions of the status attainment process.
3. The utility of longitudinal data in general and for models used to account for the educational and early occupational attainment process in particular has been respectively advocated by Rehberg, Schafer, and Sinclair (1970:46-48) and demonstrated by Sewell, Haller, and Portes (1969:84-85).
4. If the occupational prestige hierarchy is learned, research on the process by which it is learned must examine patterns of influence by occupational stereotypes as well as by (Kriesberg, 1962:244) persons (such as parents or teachers) with whom the individual interacts.
5. Specific factors related to this high dropout rate of Negroes are: (1) (Broom and Glenn, 1965:89) a widespread belief among Negroes that if they completed college they could not find employment commensurate with their qualifications; (2) (Broom and Glenn, 1965:81-82) a home background with few books and little awareness "of the nature and value of formal education;" and (3) (Youmans, Grigsby, and King, 1965: 4) a partial or complete set of parents whose formal education, income, and occupational prestige is (at least substantially) lower than is that of the parents of their white classmates (seniors).

6. If (Linn, 1966:497-498) an aspiring individual has little knowledge of or contact with the behavior of the segment of society toward which he aspires, then, by default, he may (consciously or unconsciously) attempt to approximate the values and behavior of occupational stereotypes (DeFleur and DeFleur, 1967:777) incidentally learned by television viewing. Unfortunately, the types of such role knowledge (e.g., knowledge about the prestige of various occupations in specific communities, regions, or societies, knowledge about extrinsic rewards such as income, knowledge about opportunities that exist within the various occupations for promotion or income increases) have not been empirically delineated, especially in reference to class-specific differentials in the occurrence of the same.
7. Research concerning the relationship between specific mobility orientations (e.g., occupational aspirations), and the influence of role models or reference groups has been done by Uzzell (1961), Riccio (1965), and Drabick (1967) and is discussed in Oberle and Kuvlesky (1971).
8. The counties in the sample area were classified 100 percent rural in the 1960 U. S. Census. None were adjacent to metropolitan areas.
9. Median family incomes in the sample counties ranged from \$1,737 to \$2,451 per year.
10. For a recent review of this conceptual area, see Cosby and Picou (1971).

REFERENCES

- Adams, Bert N.
1967 "Occupational Position, Mobility, and the Kin of Orientation." American Sociological Review 32 (June): 364-377.
- Bealer, Robert C.
1971 "Rural Development: Another Go-Around for Inter-Disciplinary Blunders," Paper presented at the Training Seminar in Rural Development, College of Agriculture, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, June.
- Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley.
- Blau, Peter M., John W. Gustad, Richard Jessor, Herbert S. Parnes, and Richard C. Wilcock
1956 "Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Framework." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 9 (July): 531-543.
- Bott, Elizabeth
1954 "The Concept of Class As a Reference Group," Human Relations, 7, No. 3: 259-285.
- Brim, Orville G., Jr., and Stanton Wheeler
1966 Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays. New York: Wiley.
- Brookover, Wilber
1943 "Social Roles of Teachers and Pupil Achievement." American Sociological Review. 8: 389-393.
- Broom, Leonard and Norval Glenn
1965 Transformation of the Negro American. New York: Harper.
- Clausen, John A. (ed.)
1968 Socialization and Society. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Cohen, Albert K. and Harold H. Hodges, Jr.
1963 "Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar-Class." Social Problems 10 (Spring): 303-334.
- Cosby, Arthur G. and J. Steven Picou
1971 "Agricultural Students and Anticipatory Occupational Goal Deflection." Rural Sociology 36 (June): 211-214.
- DeFleur, M. L. and DeFleur, L. B.
1967 "The Relative Contribution of Television as a Learning Source for Children's Occupational Knowledge." American Sociological Review. 32: 777-789.

Drabick, Lawrence W.

- 1967 Perceived Sources of Influence Upon Occupational and Educational Expectations. Raleigh: Agricultural Experiment Station, Progress Report Soc. (Formerly R.S.) 50, North Carolina State University.

Dynes, Russell R., Alfred C. Clarke, and Simon Dinitz

- 1956 "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable." American Sociological Review 21 (April): 212-215.

Edwards, Alba M.

- 1940 Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries--Occupation and Industry Classifications Based on the Respective Standard Classifications. Sixteenth Census of the United States. Prepared for U. S. Department of Commerce, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Erikson, Erik H.

- 1970 "Autobiographic Notes on the Identity Crisis." Daedalus (Fall).

Ginzberg, Eli, Sol W. Ginsberg, Sidney Axelrad, and John L. Herma

- 1951 Occupational Choice: An Approach to General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern

- 1958 Explorations In Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: Wiley.

Haller, Archibald O.

- 1970 "Changes in the Structure of Status Systems." Rural Sociology 35 (December): 8-17.

Kaufman, Harold F.

- 1959 "Toward An Interactional Conception of Community." Social Forces 38 (October): 8-17.

Kaufman, Harold F. and Kenneth P. Wilkinson

- 1967 Community Structure and Leadership: An Interactional Perspective in the Study of Community. State College: Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center, Bulletin 13.

Kemper, Theodore

- 1968 "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement." American Sociological Review 33 (February): 31-45.

Kriesberg, Louis

- 1962 "The Bases of Occupational Prestige: The Case of Dentists." American Sociological Review 27 (April): 238-244.

Linn, Erwin L.

- 1966 "Reference Group: A Case Study in Conceptual Diffusion." The Sociological Quarterly 7 (Autumn): 489-499.

Luchterhand, Elmer and Daniel Sydiaha

- 1966 Choice in Human Affairs: An Application to Aging-Accident-Illness Problems. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press Services.

- MacCoby, Elenor E., Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley
1958 Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.
- Mack, Raymond W.
1969 "Riot, Revolt, or Responsible Revolution: On Reference Groups and Racism." The Sociological Quarterly 10 (Spring): 147-156.
- Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.
- Middleton, Russell and Charles M. Grigg
1959 "Rural-Urban Differences In Aspirations." Rural Sociology 24 (December): 347-354.
- Musgrave, P. W.
1967 "Towards A Sociological Theory of Occupational Choice." Sociological Review 15 (March): 33-46.
- Oberle, Wayne H. and William P. Kuvlesky
1971 "Occupational Role Models of Negro Youth." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Texas Academy of Science, Nacogdoches.
- Obordo, Angelita S.
1968 "Status Orientations Toward Family Development." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Texas A&M University, January.
- Rehberg, Richard A., Walter E. Schafer, and Judie Sinclair
1970 "Toward a Temporal Sequence of Adolescent Achievement Variables." American Sociological Review 35 (February): 34-48.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr. and A. Lewis Rhodes
1963 "Status Deprivation and Delinquent Behavior." Sociological Quarterly 4 (Spring): 135-149.
- Riccio, Anthony
1965 "Occupational Aspirations of Migrant Adolescents from the Appalachian South." Vocational Guidance Quarterly 14 (Autumn): 26-30.
- Rodgers, Roy H.
1966 "The Occupational Role of the child: A Research Frontier in the Developmental Conceptual Framework." Social Forces 45 (December): 217-224.
- Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf
1970 "The Educational and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision." American Sociological Review, 35 (December): 1014-1027.
- Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes
1969 "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process." American Sociological Review 34 (February): 82-92.

- Sorokin, Peterim
1927 Social Mobility. New York: Harper.
- Sutton, Willis A. and Jiri Kolaja
1960 "The Concept of Community." Rural Sociology 25 (June): 197-198.
- Turner, Ralph
1956 "Role Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference Group Behavior." American Journal of Sociology 61 (January): 316-328.
- Uzzell, Odell
1961 "Influencers of Occupational Choices." Personnel and Guidance Journal 39 (April): 666-669.
- Warner, W. Keith
1968 "The Structural Matrix of Development." Paper presented at the Conference on the Sociology of Development, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, March.

1971 Personal conversation with author, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, June 24.
- Warner, W. Keith and William D. Heffernan
1967 "The Benefit-Participation Contingency in Voluntary Farm Organizations."
- Warner, W. Keith and A. Eugene Havens
1967 "The Logic of Collective Action: A Review Essay." Land Economics 43 (November): 446-450.
- Wilkinson, Kenneth P.
1970 "The Community as a Social Field." Social Forces 48 (March): 311-322.
- Youmans, E. Grant, S. E. Grigsby, and H. C. King
1965 After High School What: Highlights of a Study of Career Plans of Negro and White Rural Youth in Three Florida Counties. Gainesville: University of Florida, Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 1. Classification of the Texas Respondents By Race and Sex: 1966 and 1968

	1966	<u>No. Negro</u>		1966	<u>No. White</u>	
		1968	Difference		1968	Difference
Male	98	87	11	145	128	17
Female	<u>99</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>131</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	197	177	20	276	247	29

Table 2. Types of Role Models of Negro and White Boys in 1966 and 1968.

Types of Role Models	1966 ^a		1968 ^b	
	Negro (N=94)	White (N=135)	Negro (N=83)	White (N=110)
	-----Percent-----			
Teacher or school counselor	9	4	11	4
Father or mother	25	24	8	23
Older brother or sister	10	7	7	12
Relative not in immediate family	4	22	10	27
Close friend, not related	2	22	7	16
Glamour	49	21	57	15
Non-glamour	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
No information	4	10	4	18
$\chi^2 = 45.09$	df = 6	P < .001	$\bar{c} = .66$	
$\chi^2 = 46.03$	df = 6	P < .001	$\bar{c} = .57$	

Table 3. Types of Role Models of Negro and White Girls in 1966 and 1968.

Types of Role Models	1966 ^a		1968 ^b	
	Negro (N=97)	White (N=127)	Negro (N=86)	White (N=106)
	-----Percent-----			
Teacher or school counselor	21	18	28	18
Father or mother	19	17	13	18
Older brother or sister	7	10	13	14
Relative not in immediate family	20	19	12	19
Close friend, not related	6	28	16	25
Glamour	26	6	16	4
Non-Glamour	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
No information	2	4	4	13
$\chi^2 = 29.74$	df = 6	P < .001	$\bar{c} = .57$	
$\chi^2 = 14.41$	df = 6	.02 < P < .05	$\bar{c} = .34$	

Table 4. Occupational Status of Role Models of Negro and White Boys in 1966 and 1968.

Occupational Status of Role Model	1966 ^a		1968 ^b	
	Negro (N=90)	White (N=133)	Negro (N=79)	White (N=104)
	-----Percent-----			
Professional or technical worker or military officer	19	27	24	29
Glamour (pro- fessional sports, entertainer)	47	17	52	13
Owner, manager, or official or company business, or government office	5	8	3	12
Sales or clerical work	4	4	3	8
Skilled trade, craft or work	3	17	11	20
Operative or enlisted man in military	10	9	3	4
Laborer (including farm)	8	5	2	4
Farm or ranch owner or manager	2	13	2	10
Housewife	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
No information	8	12	8	24
$\chi^2 = 37.94$	df = 8	P < .001	$\bar{c} = .63$	
$\chi^2 = 36.12$	df = 8	P < .001	$\bar{c} = .51$	

Table 3. Occupational Status of Role Models of Negro and White Girls in 1966 and 1968.

Occupational Status of Role Models	1966 ^a		1968 ^b	
	Negro (N=95)	White (N=117)	Negro (N=80)	White (N=106)
	-----Percent-----			
Professional or technical worker or military officer	44	44	56	45
Glamour (professional sports, entertainer)	20	8	12	2
Owner, manager, or official of company business, or government office	4	1	5	6
Sales or clerical work	6	20	9	23
Skilled trade, craft or work	11	10	5	5
Operative or enlisted man in military	2	0	4	1
Laborer (including farm)	6	2	1	0
Farm or ranch owner or manager	3	2	3	4
Housewife	<u>4</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
No information	4	14	10	13
$\chi^2 = 24.17$	df = 8	.001 < P < .01	$\bar{c} = .41$	
$\chi^2 = 21.89$	df = 8	.001 < P < .01	$\bar{c} = .42$	